

**Growth Management Planning Council
Countywide Planning Policies 2011 Update**

Written Comments

My name is Cindy Proctor, 2950 Sun Mountain Dr, Enumclaw WA 98022. I am a fourth generation rural constituent, primarily Black Diamond recently Enumclaw.

I'd like to thank GMPC Staff for their work on the Countywide Planning Policies Final Draft, however I do have concerns regarding urban infrastructure placement in rural areas. I spoke here several months ago and I am back because I still have significant concerns regarding policies that lack teeth and allow for the continued sprawl and degradation of the rural lands, at the cost of County and State taxpayers for the benefit of suburban cities and the corporate land developers that lobby them.

I have attached a recent letter that I sent to the SCA regarding their desire to grandfather in 16 existing schools sites. I say 16 because I have left off the (3) Enumclaw Schools Districts site; although I have empathy for the schools who bought sites decades ago, it is egregious that these sites, which are not under site control or even in the ESD are included in any request for a compromise with the County. This is exactly what is wrong with the policies, and the fact the City of BD and the Developer are exploiting loopholes and lobbying for inclusion of these sites speaks volumes about the real intent of the recently added school sites. They serve no one but the developer and are for the sole purpose of forcing the movement of the UGA from BD to 218th and then to Hwy 18. If the City's want to grow they must also accommodate their urban facilities within that same UGA.

Please read by SCA letter regarding Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO), as I think the County should actively pursue the creation of this ordinance to assist in future GMA goals.

I currently don't feel like the King County Council, specifically my councilman represents me; and I think the creation of a rural ombudsmen is important. I understand the challenges of job creations and growth, all three of my brothers are union pipefitters, carpenters or heat-treater and the economic slowdown has hit our family hard, but even they recognize negative impacts of uncontrolled growth. I don't have the money or power to walk around with a lobbyist, but I do have the power to vote and organize votes for change. Do we want our government to be puppets of lobbyist and corporations or a non-partisan voice of the people?

I support the following four of its most important policies for the Rural Area:

DP-45: "Limit growth in the Rural Area to prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, reduce the need for new rural infrastructure, maintain rural character, and protect the natural environment."

DP-47: "Limit the extension of urban infrastructure improvements through the Rural Area to only cases where it is necessary to serve the Urban Growth Area and where there are no other feasible alignments. Such limited extensions may be considered only if land use controls are in place to restrict uses appropriate for the Rural Area and only if access management controls are in place to prohibit tie-ins to the extended facilities."

DP-49: "Prevent or, if necessary, mitigate negative impacts of urban development to the adjacent Rural Area."

**Growth Management Planning Council
Countywide Planning Policies 2011 Update**

Written Comments

DP-50: "Limit new public facilities located in the Rural Area to a size and scale appropriate to serve the Rural Area unless the public facilities are consistent with a rural location, such as a large passive park."

In the Final Draft's PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES chapter I fully support policies:

PF-12: "Prohibit sewer expansion in the Rural Area and Resource Lands except where needed to address specific health and safety problems threatening existing structures. If needed, provide such sewer expansion in a manner that does not increase development potential in the Rural Area."

PF-18: "Locate human, community, and educational services and facilities that serve urban populations within the Urban Growth Area, where they are accessible to the populations that they serve. Site these services and facilities in locations that are well served by transit and pedestrian and bicycle networks."

Respectfully,
Cindy Proctor
2950 Sun Mountain Dr
Enumclaw, WA 98022

From: proct@msn.com

To: kallen@redmond.gov; tbriere@rentonwa.gov; lucyk@burienwa.gov;
mcross@ci.sammamish.wa.us; bsternoff@kirklandwa.gov; ceggen@shorelinewa.gov;
lnorman@auburnwa.gov; layne.barnes@maplevalleywa.gov; amy.ockerlander@duvallwa.gov
CC: dow.constantine@kingcounty.gov; sally.clark@seattle.gov; j.robertson@bellevuewa.gov;
kimberly.claussen@kingcounty.gov

Subject: RE: COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES

Date: Fri, 2 Sep 2011 13:47:11 -0700

Suburban Cities Association Members,

Whether we like it or not, land-use decisions do impact schools, just as schools and school performance impact development patterns. However, it is misleading to perpetuate the theory that cheaper rural lands are the solution to adequate schools and therefore we must build schools that serve urban areas on rural lands. The truth is that *adequate mitigation* measures are not being required of the developers within small suburban cities and/or defined County UGAs because developers have lobbied hard to keep their profits larger at the cost of schools, and rural areas. Furthermore, in these tough economic times it is easy to be short-sighted and be lured by the unproven goal of permanent jobs generated by this unchecked growth. You (we) must all have the vision to see the long-term benefit of the preservation of rural lands.

Rural lands are critical resources for agricultural and environmental reasons as well as an area of refuge from frenetic, noisy urban activities. I strongly oppose the SCA-proposed exemption for 19 "existing" School District-owned sites in the Rural Area and any attempt to grandfather in future rural school sites identified in pending mitigation agreements.

I encourage the SCA to lobby their county officials for new legislation in the form similar to the "Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances" (APFO) that have been passed in areas like Florida and Maryland where uncontrolled growth has outpaced public facilities.

In many localities, the rate of growth is so rapid that it is outstripping local governments' abilities to provide adequate capacity in schools and other public facilities for the new residents. Many localities have overburdened infrastructure and overcrowded classrooms, even though they are making large investments in new infrastructure and new schools. Much of this problem is due to the fact that growth rates have been much more rapid than local governments anticipated at the time of approving re-zonings.

An adequate public facilities ordinance is a growth management approach that ties or conditions development approval to the availability and adequacy of public facilities and services, thus ensuring that new development does not take place unless the infrastructure is available to support it. An Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) is an ordinance adopted by the local government that allows it to defer or cease the approval of building permits and/or additional developments based upon a finding by the governing body that public facilities would not be adequate to support the proposed development at build out.

These ordinances, which are to ensure that development is timed to match public school capacity, should be integrated with a local facilities plan, a capital budget, and a mitigation

process allowing the developers to fund their own expansions. People will want to know why housing permits are still being issued while their brand new school is already 130 percent overcrowded. They will want to know why the students from their \$400,000 homes are being educated in trailers instead of traditional bricks and mortar classrooms. They want to know who is responsible for planning this mess.

Keep in mind that APFO legislation **does not**: Stop growth; Violate constitutionally guaranteed property rights; Excuse localities from their obligation to provide rights; Impose unfair costs on developers; Downzone property. It is another tool to assist in the GMA goals.

I encourage you to discuss this important issue with your fellow SCA members. Please voice the concerns of the people who live in the Rural Areas and directly will be affected by the siting those 19 Urban Schools and Urban infrastructure including the accompanying roads, utility lines, etc.

Please give due consideration to my concerns and retract your proposal. Thank you.

Regards,
Cindy Proctor
2950 Sun Mountain Dr
Enumclaw WA 98022

"This country will not be a good place for any of us to live in unless we make it a good place for all of us to live in."-Teddy Roosevelt
Please consider the environment before printing.